

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

PAUL SIMONDS,

Plaintiff,

v.

SWEEPSTAKES, *et. al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C08-0476RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's two filings of May 5, 2008, filed after the Court dismissed his case and entered judgment. Because plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the Court construes the two filings as a motion for reconsideration even though they are not labeled as such.

"Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." Local Rule 7(h).

Plaintiff has not shown manifest error in the prior order, nor has he presented new facts or legal authority. The filings simply restate the contents of his complaint, which this Court found failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Plaintiff's May 5, 2008 filings,

1 like his complaint, are unintelligible. In addition, plaintiff appears to allege claims against
2 judges in this district, but he does not provide any facts or law to defeat their judicial immunity.

3 Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. ## 12, 13) is DENIED.
4

5 DATED this 7th day of May, 2008.
6

7 

8 Robert S. Lasnik
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27